

and Democratic side—our budgets have not reflected that because when items are a No. 1 priority, they get greater than an inflationary increase. They get significant increases in the budget to reflect that No. 1 status. That is simply not happening in the area of education, particularly in title I.

So we want to fight for reform. We want to fight for accountability. But we must have those investments to make those reforms real or it is an empty promise and we are going to be leaving many children behind—millions of children, as Senator DODD said.

Let me just share with you, first, a chart that shows that money does matter. There have been hundreds of studies done, but let me just share one with you. This is a New York study that was recently done that links the rises in school financing to test scores.

In New York, 39 low-performing schools were targeted. These are schools that were failing to meet academic standards. These schools were targeted, and they were given a set of reforms: higher standards, testing, all of the things that we want to do; and, in addition, money, anywhere from \$500,000 to \$1 million was invested, for smaller class sizes, longer school days, and teacher training.

Do you know what happened. Children began to learn because the reforms were matched with the dollars. In this particular study, we saw an increase of 7 percent in reading, and 3.5 percent in math, based on the reforms and the investment.

I could share with you hundreds of studies and case examples in Louisiana, New York, and California where it proves the point that money matters. Will money correct the problem by itself? Absolutely not. We could triple the amount of money in education under the current system, and we probably would not see much in the way of results. But we are on the threshold of mandating rigorous tests, very high standards, and real consequences for failure.

I believe passionately that if we do not match that historic commitment to excellence and accountability with an historic increase in funding, we are going to leave many millions of our children behind, disappoint communities around this Nation, with unfunded mandates and broken hearts and broken promises. We simply cannot do that. We need to increase funding substantially.

Let me share another number for the record. The proposed tax cut will return \$69 billion this year. The current education budget provides only \$2 billion extra. Mr. President, with \$69 billion for investments in tax cuts, \$2 billion for investments in education, it is not nearly enough.

The three R's bill that I have been supporting and promoting asks for an \$8 billion increase in education. That would be a significant start—more than the rate of inflation. Not only would the increase help to match our

commitment to reform and accountability, but the targeting aspect is also important.

Let me share one other chart today. One of the problems, as I have tried to outline, is the lack of adequate funding and the real need to match these new accountability standards—new testing standards and new standards of excellence—with real dollars to help our schools to meet these new targets. But equally important as the amount of the funding is the way the funding is distributed.

Right now, we are missing the mark. We are missing our targets. The Federal Government provides a portion of education dollars to the State, and all of us agree—Republicans and Democrats alike—that the primary role of the Federal Government is to help level the playing field so that whether you are in a poor community or a poor State, you have an equal opportunity for an excellent education. Regardless of the fact that he or she might live in a district where there is no capacity for raising taxes, that student should still have a chance for a good education.

Our targets are missing the mark. Depicted in the center of this chart are the schools that are up to 100 percent of poverty. After 35 years, we are still not funding 100 percent of the poorest children in our Nation. We have not reached them. We have tried for 35 years, but we are not reaching the target. When you move out to those schools that are between 50 and 75 percent of poverty, we are only reaching 80 percent of our children. When you move out further, to those schools that are between 35 to 50 percent of poverty, we are reaching less than 50 percent of our children. We need 100 percent for the poorest of our children. We need 100 percent for those schools between 50 and 75 percent of poverty. And we need at least 75 to 100 percent for those schools at 35 to 50 percent of poverty. If we do not, the promise that we make to help the poor children in this country, many of whom live in States such as Louisiana, West Virginia, California, and New York—and they exist in every part of this Nation—will simply be empty. It is not fair.

As I conclude, let me just say that not only is it not fair; it is not smart because our Nation will not function at its highest capacity. We cannot remain the supereconomic power that we are. We cannot provide our industries with workers who have had skilled training if we do not make a commitment at the national level to not only increase the amount of funding for education significantly, over and above the inflation rate, but that we also target those extra dollars to the communities that need the most help, hoping that wealthier communities and affluent communities could step up to the plate and do the job, but communities that are poor and disadvantaged, the Federal Government would help.

In conclusion, let me be clear that we want to help every child in every dis-

trict in every State. In our formula that we are recommending—and I am going to be offering an amendment that will certainly do that—every child, every community, and every school district will get help from the Federal Government. But we will give special help to those districts that need it the most. This is not just about taking temperatures; it is about having the medicine to give to our children to help get them well and to give to our schools to help make them excellent. If we raise the standards and do not help our children meet the standards, we are going to have a high level of frustration, anxiety, and pain across this Nation.

So I commend the President for wanting to move to a system of greater accountability. I have supported that. My State of Louisiana is leading that effort. But if we do not couple that new accountability with increased targeting and increased investment, we will be making a very bad mistake that our Nation will pay for dearly in the decades ahead.

Let us start this new century with a renewed commitment, with renewed vigor, with a commonsense approach; yes, with more accountability and reform, with real dollars to match, targeted in a way that will really bring the promise of this great Nation to each child, whether they live in West Virginia or Louisiana. We can do it. We have the money to do it. The question is, Do we have the will? I believe we do. With the President's leadership, with bipartisan support, we can find the will to do right by our children in their schools and in their communities.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I share her enthusiasm for education. I am grateful that she is a Senator who is using her foresight and vision and talents to advance the cause of education.

TAKE YOUR DAUGHTER TO WORK DAY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia should note what for all of us is a special day on Capitol Hill. It is Take Your Daughter to Work Day. While my own precious little 3½-year-old daughter is not with me today because she is not quite old enough to appreciate the significance of this day, I do have nine beautiful little girls from Louisiana whom I have adopted for the day and a whole Girl Scout troop here from Capitol Hill, Troop 4062. I will submit their names for the RECORD.

I want the RECORD to reflect that they were here today working with us to help make this Senate and this country a better place. I wish them all much success. I am glad that so many of our Senators and staff invited the young girls today to share this experience with us.

I thank the Senator for yielding the time and ask unanimous consent to print the names in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISIANA GIRLS

Jillian Willard, Tricia Boh, Caitlin LeBlanc, Kristin Scianna, Brooke Holmes, Katherine Klimitas, Adriana Klimitas, Ashlyn Wink, Rebecca Wink.

GIRL SCOUTS—TROOP 4062

Vicki Faling, Savannah Jameson, India Teal, Daniella Harvey, Skye Dantzler, Sabina Tarnowka, Danielle Flynn, Sharae Hughley, Casey Beasley, Maeve Wiegand, Blaire Laney, Sybil Bullock, Moredia Akwara, Samantha Snow Marsh, Clara Wiegand, Lakisha Campbell.

Troop leader: Sandy Lelan.

Assistant troop leader: Connie Jameson.

Mothers of Girl Scouts: Carrie Campbell, Mary Ann Snow.

THE ROLE OF TELEVISION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to discuss an issue that I have addressed several times before on this floor—that is, the role of television in the lives of the American people. Today's television would have you believe that the television program "How to Marry a Millionaire" is a guide on how to find the perfect mate; that "Temptation Island" is a guide to stable relationships; that Al Bundy is a paragon of parental nurturing, while his wife, Peg Bundy is reflective of virtuous American womanhood; that "Who Wants To Be a Millionaire?" is educational television.

I am ashamed and embarrassed that according to a survey by the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania, 70 percent of the parents surveyed regard "Who Wants To Be a Millionaire?" as educational television.

I regret to say that the sorry state of television is becoming the sorry state of America: 59 percent of Americans can name the three Stooges, but only 17 percent of the American people can name three Supreme Court Justices; only about 50 percent of the American people could identify the Vice President of the United States, but 95 percent could identify Homer, Bart, and Marge Simpson.

Three years ago, I came to this floor to express my shock and utter amazement at the details of a story in *Time* magazine entitled, "Everything Your Children Already Know About Sex." The story told how our children are learning their sexual values from television programs like "Dawson's Creek," which boasted of a character who lost her virginity at the age of 12 while drunk. There was "Buffy the Vampire Slayer" in which a male vampire turned bad after having sex with 17-year-old Buffy.

"Why are we letting our kids watch this morally degrading, thoroughly demeaning, junk on the airwaves?" I asked.

But from that low point, television has only continued to degenerate. It seems that many television programs are busily intent on answering the

question, "how low can you go?" with the fare that they put before us.

The land, the society, the country that once produced the works of James Fenimore Cooper, Herman Melville, and Nathaniel Hawthorne, now gives us the works of Howard Stern and Jerry Springer. No wonder the late Steve Allen, a pioneer in the television industry, complained that television had become a "moral sewer."

When I think of television today, I seriously wonder whether Charles Darwin's theory of evolution is being stood on its head by popular culture. Evolution implies progress. Going from the musical accomplishments of Beethoven, Bach, and Mozart to the groans and moans of HBO's "Sex in the City" is anything but progress.

By the age of 18, the average American child will have viewed about 200,000 acts of violence on television. Before that child leaves elementary school, that child will have watched, on the average, about 20,000 murders and more than 80,000 other assaults. This means that during their most formative years, our children will witness approximately 100,000 acts of violence.

But the problem with television is more than the content of the programs alone. It is the nature of the beast—or should I say, the nature of the boob tube. There are 102 million TV homes in the USA; 42 percent of them have three or more sets. The average American spends four hours of each day—that amounts to two full months of each year—staring at the boob tube. Forty percent of the American people stare at the boob tube even while eating.

The negative impact of too much television is becoming more and more apparent as more and more studies have demonstrated: the link between television violence and real violence; the link between television and increasing obesity among young people; the link between television and declining interest in the fine arts; the link between television viewing and low academic performance. To put it bluntly, Mr. President, television is helping to create a morally irresponsible, overweight, lazy, violent, and ill-informed society.

Mr. President, this week, April 23–29, is national "TV Turnoff Week." Turn it off! Let's have more turnoff weeks; make it 52 weeks of the year, national "TV Turnoff Week." This is an effort sponsored by the TV-Turnoff Network, a grass-roots organization that has organized thousands of schools, clubs, community organizations, and religious groups to get the American people to turn off or limit their television viewing for one week to discover that there is actually life beyond the boob tube. The group has won the support and endorsements of dozens of powerful organizations, such as the American Medical Association. They have certainly won my support and my hearty endorsement. Hallelujah! Turn off that TV.

The organization's motto is, "Turn off TV. Turn on life." Their point is well taken. Life should be more rewarding and interesting than sitting in front of a box and becoming mesmerized with morally degrading, mind-numbing nonsense. That is what it is.

Instead of sitting in front of the television for 4 hours a day, get some exercise! Get out-of-doors. Go for a walk, a hike, a bike ride, or swim. It will be far better for your health.

Instead of sitting in front of the television for 4 hours a day, read a good book! Read Emerson's Essays, Carlyle's "History of the French Revolution," read history, read the Bible, read Milton's "Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained." Read "Robinson Crusoe." Read something that is worth reading. I ask, which will make one a better person, spending hours watching "Survivor," "Big Brother," and "The Weakest Link," or using the time to read a great literary work by Shakespeare, Dickens, or Goethe. Groucho Marx said that he found television to be very educational because, "Every time somebody turns on a set, I go into the other room and read a book." I like that. I say, "be like Groucho." Let's have more Groucho's. Simply turn off the television set and read a good book.

Instead of sitting in front of the television for 4 hours a day, spend some time with the family. Family members can use the opportunity to take a trip together to the local museum or art gallery, or simply talk to each other during dinner. Make your family the center of home life, not the television set. Studies by professor Barbara Brock at Eastern Washington University found that in TV-free families, parents have about an hour of meaningful conversation with their children every day, compared with the national average of 38 minutes a week. Here would be an opportunity for parents to emphasize their values—not Hollywood's—to their most precious asset—their children.

I don't want to leave the impression that all television is bad. I have seen some very educational, very informative, very uplifting, very good pictures, shows, and plays on television. There is much programming that is truly educational. I have been to one movie since I have been in Washington. I have been in Washington now 49 years. I have been to one movie. I left that movie. I didn't stay and watch it through. I became bored and I walked out. Yul Brynner was, I think, the main player in that movie. I walked out. But just within the last few weeks, I watched a picture in which Yul Brynner played. I believe it was—I am trying to remember now. I have watched some good pictures recently. I watched "The Ten Commandments," which was a good picture. That may have been it. Yul Brynner plays in it and I liked him in it. He played well. So I don't want to leave the impression that all television is bad. I think that C-Span, PBS, and the History Channel